COLERIDGE, PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Coleridge’s relation to his German contemporaries constitutes the toughest problem in assessing his standing as a thinker. For the last half-century this relationship has been described, ultimately, as parasitic. As a result, Coleridge’s contribution to religious thought has been seen primarily in terms of his poetic genius. This book revives and deepens the evaluation of Coleridge as a philosophical theologian in his own right. Coleridge had a critical and creative relation to, and kinship with, German thought. Moreover, the principal impulse behind his engagement with that philosophy is traced to the more immediate context of the English Unitarian–Trinitarian controversy of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This book re-establishes Coleridge as a philosopher of religion and as a vital source for contemporary theological reflection.
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Mind and understanding is, as it were, a diaphanous and crystalline globe, or a kind of notional world, which hath some reflex image, and correspondent ray, or representation in it, to whatsoever is in the true and real world of being.

(Ralph Cudworth, *The True Intellectual System of the Universe*, vol. ii. p. 517)
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Notes on the text

The textual basis of this work is the new excellent critical edition of Coleridge’s *Aids to Reflection* edited by John Beer. This is based upon the corrected edition of 1831 rather than the original 1825 edition. John Beer’s critical edition of *Aids to Reflection* is cited as *Aids*. I have excluded all textual history and much of Coleridge’s biography in this work because it is dealt with precisely and thoroughly in the extremely rich and informative new edition. References to other Coleridge texts are as far as possible to the Princeton critical edition. I have tried to avoid manuscript references, and if I mention hitherto unpublished material, I refer to journals or books where these materials are quoted and discussed.

For reasons given, this interpretation of *Aids to Reflection* is not meant to be an exhaustive account of Coleridge’s thought. In particular I omit considerations about the development of Coleridge’s mind. It also seems appropriate to leave to one side discussions of Coleridge’s plagiarisms and citations of Schelling in the *Biographia Literaria* and developments in the *Opus Maximum*. I refer the reader to the seminal work by John Beer, Robert Barth S.J., and James Engell on Coleridge’s intellectual milieu. John Muirhead’s book *Coleridge as Philosopher* (London, 1930) is still excellent on Coleridge’s general philosophy. Graham Davidson’s *Coleridge’s Career* (Basingstoke, 1990) is a powerfully argued vision of Coleridge’s intellectual development. Mary Anne Perkins’ *Coleridge’s Philosophy* (Oxford, 1994) is a full and useful account of the sources and development of the logos concept in Coleridge’s projected *Opus Maximum*. Friedrich Uehlein’s *Die Manifestation des Selbstbewusstseins* (Hamburg, 1982) is a complex and rigorously argued account of Coleridge’s notion of Subjectivity, especially in relation to Schelling.

I do wish to explain something of my reference to, and quotation of, Plotinus and the German Idealists. I use a capital with the term
Notes on the text

‘Neoplatonist’ in order to emphasise the particular structure of this tradition of thought, including those elements in the philosophy that are not strictly ‘Platonic’. Plotinus’ writings are usually referred to as the ‘Enneads’ or ‘Nines’ because his pupil Porphyry arranged his master’s work into six sets of nine treatises. It is hence strictly inaccurate to write of ‘Ennead VI 8’ when one wishes to refer to the individual Treatise vi. 8 since this is precisely the eighth treatise in the sixth Ennead. Further, we write Plotinus’ Treatise vi. 8 (39) and then chapter and verse because this was the thirty-ninth treatise which Plotinus composed. Quotations are always taken from A. H. Armstrong’s authoritative translation (which fortunately preserves Porphyry’s division into nines and sixes). Coleridge’s ‘Platonism’ is roughly Plotinus mediated by the great Renaissance Christian philosopher-theologian Marsilio Ficino. Coleridge’s direct interest in Ficino is limited, but Ficino provided the lens through which Plato was perceived by Coleridge: both Christian and Neoplatonic.

The situation with respect to German Idealism is, unfortunately, much less satisfactory than with Plotinus. He is a very difficult and surprisingly technical philosopher, but there are few serious scholarly controversies in Plotinus studies. The German Idealist philosophers, on the contrary, have been subject to very controversial interpretation. Many leading scholars of German Idealism minimise the potent religious component in this philosophy. Coleridge on the contrary, saw the movement as profoundly religious, and I shall explain why this was entirely justified. Schelling, in particular, was largely ignored until after the Second World War when he began to be seen as more than a stage on the way to Hegel. There is a revival of Schelling studies at present but interpretations differ strongly. The critical Schelling edition is in its infancy, and only a small section of Schelling’s opus has been translated into English. References to Schelling are to the edition of his son K. F. A. Schelling in fourteen volumes (Stuttgart/Augsburg, 1856–61).